biological data.' And for Bertalanffy, as for so many others, ' psychical components[J] are mystical, epi-phenomenal, unscientific, and metaphysical. Biology, he says, having handed over the psychical factors to psychology, has no further concern with them. But he makes no attempt to justify his application to the psychical factors of all those unkind adjectives and his arbitrary exclusion of psychology from its place among the bio-logical sciences.

If one may suggest the implied syllogism, it would seem to run: All psychical factors are metaphysical, and all metaphysics is the devil. It is a notable instance of the harm done by the practice, so common among men of science, of flinging about the word * metaphysical' as a mere *Schimpfavort* without attempting to understand what meaning they attach to it.

Thus rejecting the psychic factors of organisms, Bertalanffy naturally rejects also all teleology, except in so far as it is written in inverted commas ; for he identifies, rightly perhaps, the psychical and the teleological. Of the word * organismic' he writes: * This word replaces the old term " teleological". It will be seen in what follows that " teleology" as we conceive it has nothing to do with any psychological or vitalistic assumptions which were often confused with this point of view.' And later: * Applying the organismic method means in this sense investigating the vital processes with a view to discovering how far they contribute to the maintenance of organic wholeness.

Ungerer points out that the so-called " purposefulness " of organisms is a pure fiction [one wonders whether Ungerer ever tried to drive a hungry pig]; it is " as if " a " purpose " were followed in organic processes—namely, the maintenance